1		HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
8	AT SEATTLE	
9	BOILERMAKERS NATIONAL ANNUITY	NO 2.00 at 00027MID
10	TRUST FUND, on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated,	NO. 2:09-cv-00037MJP
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER RESERVING RULING ON
12	V.	PARTIES' SECOND STIPULATED MOTION TO MODIFY BRIEFING
13	WAMU MORTGAGE PASS THROUGH	SCHEDULE ON DEFENDANTS' PENDING MOTIONS TO DISMISS
14	CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-AR1, et al.,	AND SCHEDULING A TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE
15	Defendants.	CONFERENCE
16		
17	NEW ORLEANS EMPLOYEES'	
18	RETIREMENT SYSTEM, et al., individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	No. 2:09-cv-00134 MJP
19	•	
20	Plaintiffs,	
21	v.	
22	FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE	
23	CORPORATION, et al.,	
24	Defendants.	
25	This matter comes before the Court on the parties' revised stipulated motion to modify	
26	the briefing schedule on Defendants' motions to dismiss and to withdraw Plaintiffs' motion for	
27		
	ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINES (NO. 2:09-CV-0037-MJP) - 1	

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

leave to amend the consolidated complaint. (Dkt. No. 156.) Having reviewed the parties' submission, the Court finds and orders as follows:

- The Court shall hold a telephonic conference with counsel in this matter at 10:40
 on Thursday, March 18, 2010. The telephonic conference shall immediately follow
 oral argument on the motions to appoint in the <u>Doral</u> action. The Court requests
 that counsel be prepared to discuss the issue of consolidation at that time.
- 2. Both the original and revised stipulation provide that if the Court declines to adopt the parties' stipulation, the pending motions will be re-noted. (Dkt. No. 153 at 2; Dkt. No. 156 at 3.) While these paragraphs may simply suggest alternative relief, the Court notes that the Order denying the initial stipulation did not change any deadlines on any pending motion. (Dkt. No. 154.) Because the parties have operated under the assumption the motions would be granted, Plaintiffs have missed their deadline to respond to Defendants' motions to dismiss and Defendants have missed their deadline to respond to Plaintiffs' motion to amend. (Dkt. Nos. 138, 144, 146, 152.) This is particularly puzzling because the stipulation was filed after both parties' respective responses were due.
- 3. The Court RESERVES RULING on the stipulated motion extending the briefing schedule (Dkt. No. 156) until after the telephonic conference on March 18, 2010. The Court will set an appropriate briefing schedule at that time. Accordingly, neither Plaintiffs nor Defendants need to file any material in support or in opposition to any pending motion before the March 18, 2010 conference.

The Clerk shall transmit a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

Dated this 12th day of March, 2010.

Marsha J. Pechman

United States District Judge

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINES

(NO. 2:09-CV-0037-MJP) - 2